UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/935,152	08/22/2001	Veijo M. Tuoriniemi	2110	9248

28747 7590 10/18/2006

VEIJO M. TUORINIEMI
47 WOODLAND AVE.
APT 107
SUMMIT, NJ 07901

EXAMINER	
JOO, JOSHUA	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2154	

DATE MAILED: 10/18/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/935,152	TUORINIEMI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Joshua Joo	2154	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *15 September 2006*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) 2-29 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) 2-29 is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Detailed Action

1. Claims 2-29 are presented for examination.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 9/15/2006 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claims 2-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

i) Regarding claim 28, the limitation of "unscripted two-way communication" is not supported by the instant specification. Applicant is apparently using the limitation of "unscripted" to represent a certain type of communication. However, the specification does not clearly define or support the limitation "unscripted two-way communication".

ii) Regarding claim 12, the limitation of "geographical location information that can be obscured by said supply client computer with predetermined accuracy defining a possible area in which the supply client computer is located; and said possible area is much smaller than search area" is not supported by the instant specification. In the instant specification, Page 4, lines 25-28 recites that users might want their "location unclear" and the host server can "remove client computer's location from the map" and "not show the distance". Page 7, lines 26-27 recites, "A user, who wants to avoid detailed

information, can adjust the accuracy of the location information". The specification supports obscuring a user's location, but does not define a possible area and the possible area much smaller than the search area.

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claims 2-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

i) Regarding claim 28, the type of two-communication that an "unscripted two-way communication" provides is not clearly claimed nor explained in the specification. Therefore, the claim will be given the broadest reasonable interpretation. According to Webster's dictionary, "unscripted" is defined as "not following a prepared script", wherein "script" is defined as "something written: text". Thus, "unscripted two-way communication" will be interpreted as non-text two-way communication.

ii) Regarding claim 28, it is unclear if the limitation of "at least location information" on Page 5, line 19 is referring to demand-side geographic location information or supply-side geographic location information.

iii) Regarding claim 29, "said location information" lacks proper antecedent basis. Is "said location information" referring to "supply-side geographic location information"

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 9/15/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argued that:

8. (1) Tanaka does not suggest enabling a demand person (A) the prerogative of claim 28 to make immediate, unscripted two-way communication to supply person (B).

9. In response, as stated above in the 35 USC § 112 rejection, the limitation of "unscripted two-way communication" is not supported by specification and is given the broadest reasonable interpretation.

Applicant asserts that, "cellular telephone or e-mail [are] forms of unscripted two-way communication" (Remarks. Page 6, lines 12-14). Tanaka teaches that email message can be send or contact by phone calls (Col 4, lines 36-39). If the claim was taken into consideration in view of

Applicant's definition in the Remarks, then Tanaka would also provide unscripted two-way communication, as it is well known that users can choose not to answer the email or phone call.

Furthermore, Applicant asserts that, "In Tanaka's method, person B has the sole decisionmaking capacity to decide whether or not to make immediate, unscripted two-way communication" (Remarks. Page 10, lines 16-17). Then, "unscripted two-way communication" as defined by the Applicant is taught by Tanaka. Even if "unscripted two-way communication" is taken into consideration in view of Applicant's definition, if person B is enabled to perform "unscripted two-way communication," it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to enable person A to perform "unscripted two-way communication" just as person B because 1) the communication is two-way, so it would be obvious to provide similar capabilities to persons A and B, and; 2) person A is acting as both a demand and supply client since person A is searching for person B, but person A could also be the searched person for person B or from another person.

10. (2) It would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Tanaka and Obradovich because Tanaka uses geographic location information only for performing a search, and Examiner's suggested motivation does not outweigh Tanaka's concern of security and safety.

11. In response, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988)and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

In this case, Tanaka's invention relates to a matching and personal meeting service (Col 1, lines 16-25), wherein Tanaka teaches that Person A and Person B can choose to initiate face-to-face contact (Col 4, lines 40-41). If geographical location information of both person A and person B are provided to the host server, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the location

information, not only for the purpose of matching, but also for the purpose of allowing the persons to meet each other. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Tanaka and Obradovich with the motivation that the teachings of Obradovich to transmit a user's location information to another user would improve the system of Tanaka by allowing users to determine the location of another user and track the user as taught by Obradovich. The combination of Tanaka and Obradovich would provide users' contact information and also user's location information, which would facilitate the meeting of users.

In addition, Obradovich also teaches of a user tracking a third party's location by having the third party send GPS data updates (Col 11, lines 56-57). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the third party not provide GPS data updates, i.e. not provide location information to a person, which would maintain Tanaka's security.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

12. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

13. Claims 2-6, 11, 13-16, 18-26, 28-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanaka, US Patent #6,819,919 (Tanaka hereinafter), in view of Obradovich, US Patent #6,525,768 (Obradovich hereinafter).

14. As per claim 28, Tanaka teaches substantially the invention as claimed including a computer assisted method of matching supply and demand, Tanaka's teachings comprising steps of:

a) storing on a host server demand-side geographic location information, and at least one demand parameter derived from at least one demand client computer (Col 2, lines 19-26, 49-52, 63-67; Col 3, lines 67. User profile and GPS position is stored in database. Search parameters.);

b) storing on said host server said supply-side geographic location information, and at least one supply parameter derived fro at least one supply client computer (Col 2, lines 19-26, 49-52, 63-67; Col 3, lines 67. User profile and GPS position is stored in database. Search parameters.);

c) said host server searching within a predetermined search area supply client computers having at least one supply parameter matching at least one demand parameter of a demand client computer (Col 4, lines 1-10. Find matching profiles within user defined search area.);

d) based on said searching, said host server providing at least one of said demand client computer (Col 4, lines 17-27. Provides users matching request.) and a means to enable immediate, unscripted two-way communication of said supply client computers matching demand parameters (Col 4, lines 38-40. Contact initiated through phone calls.); and

e) at least one of said demand-side geographic location information or at least one of said supply-side geographic information is updated automatically on said host sever in real time from a geographic location information system (Col 2, lines 49-51; Col 3, lines 56-61. User GPS information is updated automatically in real-time.).

15. Tanaka teaches substantially the invention as claimed. However, Tanaka does not teach of a host server providing at least location information. Obradovich teaches of receiving geographic location information from a user and a third party (Col 10, lines 35-36; Col 11, line 64-65) and providing the geographic location information of the user and the third party to the user or the third party through a displayable map (Col 12, lines 11-19).

16. Tanaka discloses a system that relates to personal meeting/matching services (Col 1, lines 16-26; Col 2, lines 14-18). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Tanaka and Obradovich with the motivation that the teachings of Obradovich to transmit a user's location information to another user would improve the system of Tanaka by allowing users to determine the location of another user and track the user as taught by Obradovich. The combination of Tanaka and Obradovich would provide users' contact information and also user's location information, which would facilitate the meeting of users.

17. As per claim 2, Tanaka teaches the computer assisted method of claim 28 wherein said geographic location information is automatically derived and updated from a GPS (Col 2, lines 65-66. GPS. Col 2, lines 49-51; 52-60. Automatically updated.).

18. As per claim 3, Tanaka teaches of providing continuously changing geographic information (Col 3, lines 55-61) and a server capable of determining the locations of the users (Col 4, lines 2-6). However, Tanaka does not teach the computer assisted method wherein map coordinates is calculated on said host server. Obradovich teaches of calculating map coordinates from location information provided by the user and the third party (Col 11, lines 64-66; Col 12, line 11-19).

19. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Tanaka and Obradovich because the teachings of Obradovich to calculate map coordinates would improve the teachings of Tanaka by allowing the server to provide the user's location and the matching user on a displayable map.

20. As per claim 4, Tanaka teaches the computer assisted method of claim 28 wherein said geographic information is and automatically derived and updated form telephone network positioning

system (Col 2, lines 66-67. Cellular triangulation. Col 3, lines 52-55. Location is updated automatically.).

21. As per claim 5, Tanaka teaches the computer assisted method of claim 28 wherein a user of said supply-side or said demand side client computer provides said geographic location information (Col 3, lines 8-10. User manually enters position.).

22. As per claim 6, Tanaka teaches the computer assisted method of claim 5 wherein said geographic location information is given as map coordinates (Col 3, lines 21-22. Latitude and longitude coordinates.).

23. As per claim 11, Tanaka teaches the computer assisted method of claim 28 wherein said geographic location information can be saved for future (Col 2, lines 49-52. User's location is stored in a database.).

24. As per claim 13, Tanaka does not teach the computer assisted method wherein at least said supply-side geographic location information is used to pinpoint the location of said supply-side geographic location on a map provided to a demand client computer. Obradovich teaches of a user receiving a third party's data and GPS encoded map for displaying the location of the third party on the map (Col 11, lines 56-49; Col 12, lines 10-19).

25. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Tanaka and Obradovich because the teachings of Obradovich to obtain a user's geographic location information and a third party's geographic location information and display the

locations of the user and the third party on a map would improve the teachings of Tanaka by allowing a user to easily locate a matched user by looking at the map.

26. As per claims 14 and 15, Tanaka does not teach the computer assisted method of claim 13 wherein said map is provided by a host server or an Internet server. Obradovich teaches a data provider of providing a map (Col 13, lines 40-41; Col 15, lines 20-23) through the Internet (Col 16, lines 41-42).

27. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Tanaka and Obradovich because the teachings of Obradovich to provide a map from an Internet server would improve the teachings of Tanaka by allowing the user to receive updated or additional maps, and storing the maps on the server would save memory space since memory space is limited on a mobile device.

28. As per claim 16, Tanaka and Obradovich taught the computer assisted method of claim 13. Tanaka further teaches the method wherein said map is resident of a client computer (Col 5, lines 5-11. Map on mobile unit.).

29. As per claim 18, Tanaka teaches the computer assisted method of claim 28 wherein said demand and supply parameters are chosen by a user of a client computer (Col 2, lines 21-25. User chooses parameters.).

30. As per claim 19, Tanaka teaches the computer assisted method of claim 28 wherein said demand and supply parameters are constant (Col 2, lines 24-26. Profile information is standard.).

31. As per claim 20, Tanaka teaches the computer assisted method of claim 28 wherein optional additional freestyle information can be given by a user of a client computer (Col 2, lines 25-26. User have the option to customize content.).

32. As per claim 21, Tanaka teaches the computer assisted method of claim 28 wherein a demand area definition parameter is derived from at least one client computer and said demand area definition parameter is stored on a host server (Col 6, lines 50-54. Search area specified by user. Col 2, lines 19-21. Profile is stored on the server.).

33. As per claim 22, Tanaka teaches the computer assisted method of claim 28 wherein one of said demand or supply parameter is a search area parameter and said search area parameter is a user-determined distance around the search-location (Col 6, lines 50-54. Search area specified by user.).

34. As per claim 23, Tanaka teaches the computer assisted method of claim 22 wherein said host server continuously updates said searching so as to include updated movement of said search area parameter and updated entry or exit from said search area parameter of a supply client computer or a demand client computer being searched within said search area parameter (Col 4, lines 4-11. Server continuously updates searching. Searching involves checking matching users in search radius. Col 3, lines 50-60. Server receives updated positions of users.).

35. As per claims 24 and 25, Tanaka teaches of the user capable of contacting a matched user through the use of the user's device (Col 4, lines 23-27) by contact means such as sending email or calling the person (Col 4, lines 36-41). However, Tanaka does not specifically teach the computer assisted method of claim 1 wherein at least one of said supply or demand client can contact a matched supply client or

demand client by activating an available contact means on a computer screen and wherein a computer assisted method of claim 24 wherein said activating an available contact means is done by selecting an icon on said computer screen. Obradovich teaches of using a mobile device that maintains location information of third parties via a GPS system, where a user of the mobile device can contact a third party by selecting a touch point, which enables entry of the third party's phone number (Fig. 11; Col 12, lines 1-14).

36. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Tanaka and Obradovich because the teachings of Obradovich to allow a user to contact another user by selecting a touch point on the screen which enables entry of the third party's contact information would improve the teachings of Tanaka by specifically specifying the method in which the user contacts the matched user.

37. As per claim 26, Tanaka teaches the computer assisted method of claim 28 wherein said contact means is made anonymous (Col 4, lines 36-39. Email can be sent without revealing address or location. Caller id blocked.).

38. As per claim 29, Tanaka teaches the computer assisted method of claim 28 wherein said location information of a user of a supply client computer comprises geographical location information (Col 2, lines 19-26, 49-52, 63-67. GPS data of user.).

39. Claims 7-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanaka and Obradovich, in view of Craport et al, US Patent #5,978,747 (Craport hereinafter).

40. As per claims 7 and 8, Tanaka teaches of providing geographic information as a postal address (Col 3, lines 10-11) and further teaches of converting received geographic information into a data format used by the system (Col 3, lines 22-25). However, Tanaka does not teach the computer assisted method geographic information is converted to map coordinates by a dedicated program on said host server. Craport teaches of providing address information (Col 10, lines 16-19), where address information is converted into map coordinates by program modules (Col 12, lines 44-53).

41. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Tanaka, Obradovich, and Craport because all three teachings deal with identifying the geographical area of a mobile device. Furthermore, the teachings of Craport to convert address into map coordinates by program modules would improve the system of Tanaka and Obradovich by providing a precise and accurate location of users, and the map coordinates allow user locations to be displayed on a map for more easily locating users.

42. As per claim 9, Tanaka, Obradovich, and Craport taught the computer assisted method of claim 7. Tanaka further teaches wherein said postal address is entered through a stationary supply-side or said demand side client computer (Col 3, lines 5-7, 15. Computer. Col 3, lines 51-53. Fixed-point.).

43. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanaka, Obradovich, and Craport, in view of Milani et al, US Patent #5,684,860 (Milani hereinafter)

44. As per claim 10, Tanaka does not teach the computer assisted method of claim 7 wherein said postal address is given by a dispatcher. Milani teaches of an operator collecting and providing the address of a user for taxi service (Col 1, lines 20-30).

45. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Tanaka, Obradovich, and Milani because the teachings of Milani for a dispatcher to collect and provide the address of a user would improve the system of Tanaka and Obradovich by allowing a mobile user without GPS or triangulation capability to provide geographic location information.

46. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanaka and Obradovich in view of Olivier, US Patent #6,480,885.

47. As per claim 12, Tanaka does not teach a computer assisted method of claim 28 wherein said location information of a user of a supply client computer comprises geographical location information that can be obscured by said supply client computer with predetermined accuracy defining a possible area in which the supply client computer is located; and said possible area is much smaller than said search area. Olivier teaches of a user's geographic location being obscured by using a small geographical area instead of the exact location (Col 15, lines 43-51).

48. Tanaka and Olivier do not teach of defining a possible area much smaller than said search area. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to define an area smaller than the search area because doing so would increase the probability that matching users are outside the user's geographic location, which would allow users to maintain privacy, as opposed to matching with all other users within the obscure area. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Tanaka, Obradovich, and Olivier because the teachings of Olivier to obscure the geographic location of a user would improve the system of Tanaka and Obradovich by improving the privacy of users and reduces the chance of pinpointing a user's location.

49. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanaka and Obradovich, in view of Jones, US Patent #6,741,927 (Jones hereinafter).

50. As per claim 17, Tanaka does not teach the computer assisted method of claim 28 wherein said distance between a geographical location information given by a supply client computer and geographic location information given by a demand client computer is measured on a host server and distributed to either demand-side client computer or supply-side client computer or both of them. Jones teaches in the "Background of the Invention" of calculating and providing a distance between locations for a user of a mobile device with a GPS receiver (Col 1, lines 52-59).

51. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Tanaka, Obradovich, and Jones because the teachings of Jones' "Background of the Invention" to calculate and provide the distance between the user's location and the destination would improve the system of Tanaka and Obradovich by allowing the system to specifically know the distance between the user and a matched user when a matched user falls within the user's search radius.

52. Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanaka and Obradovich, in view of Dowling et al, US Patent #6,522,875 (Dowling hereinafter).

53. As per claim 27, Tanaka teaches the computer assisted method said geographic position of said client computer or said demand client computer is determined from a multiplicity of GPS satellites (Col 2, lines 65-66. GPS receiver.). Tanaka also teaches of transmitting parameters and additional information (Col 2, lines 19-26). However, Tanaka does not teach of a said demand-side and said-supply side geographic location information, with parameters and possible additional information, are delivered to and distributed from said host server by a two-way satellite link. Dowling teaches of a mobile unit

receiving GPS transmissions, where a satellite may be used to transmit and receive satellite communications data (Col 6, lines 39-47).

54. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Tanaka and Dowling because both teachings deal with a mobile unit receiving geographic position from a global positioning system. Furthermore, the teachings of Dowling to transmit and receive data using satellites would improve the system of Tanaka and Obradovich by allowing users in different geographical areas to transmit and receive data, especially in areas where ground based communications is weaker or not possible.

Conclusion

55. A shortened statutory period for reply to this Office action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action.

56. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joshua Joo whose telephone number is 571 272-3966. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Thursday 8AM to 5PM and every other Friday.

57. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John A. Follansbee can be reached on 571 272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

58. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-

direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

October 13, 2006
JJ

JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100